

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division**

ePLUS, INC.,)	
)	
)	Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-620
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**REPORT OF EXPERT MICHAEL I. SHAMOS, PH.D, J.D.
CONCERNING INVALIDITY**

CONFIDENTIAL

231. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to make the combination because

232. One of skill in the art would also have been motivated to make the combination because the '940 patent states, "It is another object to provide a system and method which facilitates the processing of orders for goods or services transmitted by a user." 3:9-11. This capability is provided by J-CON.

233. Furthermore, the '940 patent provided the multi-source capability demanded by the industry at and before the time of the invention.

234. Additionally, the J-CON system included features that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use with the '940 invention, including the ability to electronically determine the current availability in the inventory at multiple locations, to perform a cross-referencing of data relating to an item on a requisition to determine an alternative source for the same item and/or an acceptable substitute for the item initially selected, and the ability to generate multiple purchase orders from a single requisition (as described above and in detail in Exhibit 3).

The Combination of J-CON and P.O. Writer Renders the Asserted Claims Obvious

235. It is my opinion that J-CON anticipates all the Asserted Claims. It is also my opinion that P.O. Writer anticipates all of the asserted claims.

236. To the extent that J-CON and/or P.O. Writer are not deemed to anticipate any Asserted Claim, it is my opinion that such claim would have been obvious in view of the combination of J-CON with P.O. Writer. The same reasons for making the previous two combinations apply to combining the J-CON system as described in the "J-CON Manual" with P.O. Writer Plus V. 10 as described in the P.O. Writer Plus Manual. The P.O. Writer Plus V. 10 system provided the multi-vendor capability demanded by the industry at and before the time of the invention. The J-CON system included features that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use with the PO Writer system, including additional details about

performing a cross-referencing of data relating to an item on a requisition to determine an alternative source for the same item and/or an acceptable substitute for the item initially selected.

The Combination of J-CON and Gateway Renders the Asserted Claims Obvious

237. It is my opinion that J-CON anticipates all the Asserted Claims. It is also my opinion that the Gateway 2000/MRO system anticipates all of the asserted claims.

238. To the extent that J-CON and/or Gateway are not deemed to anticipate any Asserted Claim, it is my opinion that such claim would have been obvious in view of the combination of J-CON with Gateway. The same reasons for making the previous three combinations apply to combining the J-CON system with the Gateway system.

239. Additionally, the J-CON system had a sophisticated system for keeping track of equivalent items, dividing them into "Replaced Parts," "Substitute Parts," and "Can-Use Parts" and a number of different methods of converting among item numbers and substituting alternate parts that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use with the Gateway system. (See, e.g., L0124837; L0123551). Similarly, the Gateway Manual discloses in detail how to select a subset of catalogs from a collection of catalogs and then limit a search for items to the selected subset of catalogs, which one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use with J-CON system. (See, e.g., SAP_2531709-10, SAP_2531615-16, L0128380).

Secondary Considerations

240. I understand that ePlus contends that secondary considerations demonstrate that the invention is not obvious. (See, e.g., "Plaintiff ePlus Inc.'s First Supplemental Answers and Objections to Defendant Lawson Software, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories" (hereinafter, "Rog. 6").) I understand that ePlus will allege commercial success, demand for the patented product, and praise by others. While I reserve the right to reply to these arguments after I have reviewed ePlus's expert report, the evidence ePlus intends to present (as I currently understand it) does not demonstrate a nexus between these secondary considerations and the claimed invention.